

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100050018-8

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100050018-8

PART II

COMRADE LUIGI LONGO'S FIRST SPEECH IN THE NAME OF THE
ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY DELEGATION

Dear Comrades,

The delegation of the Italian Communist Party hails the convocation of this new Conference of the representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the entire world. Let us say at the outset that we approve the draft Declaration that was submitted to us for discussion, despite our conviction that it would profit by condensation and a judicious pruning of repetitions.

We shall suggest some changes in its text at the proper time.

We approve the Declaration chiefly because it reaffirms the full validity of the statements of principle on the prime issues of our time, defined by the 20th and 21st Congresses of the PCUS and by the Declaration and the Appeal for Peace of the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1957. In the second place, we approve the new Declaration because,

taking these positions as its point of departure, and inspired by the creative concept of Marxism-Leninism, it supplies additional guidance on the problems that have emerged in the last three years. These are problems of great pith and moment, as was pointed out in the introductory remarks of Comrade Suslov, and thoroughly demonstrated in those of Comrade Khrushchev, with which we are in complete agreement; their importance has been highlighted by the discussion in which we are now engaged.

It is on the basis of this attitude that the Italian delegation completely approves of the statement in the new Declaration that "the decisions of the 20th and 21st PCUS Congresses have had very special meaning for the entire international workers movement and for all the Socialist countries; they are a model of creative development of the revolutionary theory."

Our Chinese comrades ask us to suppress this passage. The Italian delegation must oppose an absolute "No" to this suggestion. To strip the Declaration of an explicit recognition of the international import of the decisions of the 20th and 21st Congresses of the PCUS would be to fall short of historical truth, and to downgrade the value of the positions taken on principles on that occasion.

The entire political line of our Party is a recognition of the validity of those political principles. Furthermore, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the PCUS, with the decisions of its last two Congresses and with the practical application of those decisions, has given proof not only of a fine creative

Marxist-Leninist spirit; it has also supplied potent aid to all the Communist and Workers' Parties in developing their own creative work. Specifically, it has stimulated them to shake off the shackles of inflexibility and of dogmatism. In this way, it has set them free to fight whole-heartedly against revisionism, both in the workers' movement and in their own ranks.

Thus, by means of the decisions of the 20th and 21st Congresses, the PCUS has once again raised and strengthened not only its own authority and prestige, and that of the Soviet Union and its leaders, all of which were already very great; it has also contributed to raising the authority and the prestige of its brother parties, particularly of those that were wise enough to profit by its example and its contribution to Marxism-Leninism. To get down to minute detail, let us say that we are particularly enthusiastic not only of the statements on peaceful coexistence, on the non-inevitability of war, and on the possibility of peaceful transition to Socialism in many capitalist countries, even under present conditions; we are well aware of the value of the criticism of the cult of personality and of the errors of Stalin. Everybody knows that this criticism was a necessary starting-point for a full restoration of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism in the inner life of the parties, and for providing a new drive, a new incentive, to Socialist democracy. Any attempt, whether it be cloaked in an easy-going approach to the function of the leaders or under any other disguise, to retreat on these issues

would be a criminal mistake. At the same time, everyone knows how the PCUS came to define these positions and to translate them into consistent political action. Hence it is impossible to fail to recognize that it was Comrade Khrushchev who was the chief architect, the most single-minded and the most determined. The steps taken by the Soviet Union in defense of the peace, for peaceful coexistence, for summit meetings and disarmament; for the protection of the independence of nations threatened by imperialist aggression, and for the liberation of all the colonial peoples, have had the widest and deepest possible repercussions in the hearts and souls of the people. These are the actions that have made it possible to strike a decisive blow at the entire campaign of lies and duplicity that has been mounted, particularly in the capitalist countries, by the enemies of the workers' movement and the foes of Socialism. Thanks to these actions, the calumny of the fosterers of the cold war and the reactionaries as to alleged Soviet "aggression," as to the Communist parties painted as "tools of Moscow," and as to Communism defined as "the enemy of freedom", have fallen even deeper into the quicksand of the ridiculous.

As a consequence, the Soviet Union's fervent will for peace, and its mighty economic, technical and scientific achievements, along with those of all the other Socialist countries, have given heart, of recent years and in every land, to the Communist militants and their sympathizers in the great working masses, and have fired the imagination and the interest of all classes of the population in Communist ideas and activities. This has opened up

new vistas of action and of progress before all our Parties. All this, in our opinion, adds up to a highly positive datum, one which, like our own experience, confirms the soundness and the validity of the decisions taken at the 20th and 21st PCUS Congresses, and of their application ever since by its leaders.

This is why we are so taken aback by the statement of our Chinese Comrades, who maintain that the PCUS Central Committee, on a whole range of matters of principle, has drifted away "in the most obvious manner, from the proper road of Marxism-Leninism, and from the Moscow Declaration." We hold that this accusation is false and even slanderous, in that it is utterly unfounded, and in that it transcends the bounds of admissible criticism. We hold, on the contrary, that the PCUS Central Committee, and Comrade Khrushchev in particular, during all these years, have shown in the working out of issues of principle and in their practical implementation the clearest possible evidence of their loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and to the Moscow Declaration; indeed, this loyalty

has been most consistently and most convincingly proven.

Words fail us for proper denunciation of the Albanian Delegation's attempt to cast doubt, in this Conference, on the justice of the condemnation of the personality cult and of the errors of Stalin, on the propriety of the effort made in 1955 to woo Yugoslavia back to more correct political positions, and, in any case, to improve relations between Yugoslavia and the other Socialist countries; on the accuracy of the analysis,

in no way mysterious, of the political causes of the Hungarian counter-revolution and of the events in Poland, as courageously made by the international Communist movement, particularly by the valiant Comrades who now lead our brother Parties in Poland and Hungary.

This attempt by the Albanian delegate is beneath contempt, both because of the content of the political positions on which it is based, and because of the method employed. In connection with the method, we refer to two issues. The first is the hypocrisy with which he stated, on the one hand, that until the Bucharest Conference in May of 1960, there was perfect agreement between the Soviet Communist Party and the

Albanian Workers' Party. No sooner does he say this than he turns about and clearly proves that there was no such agreement on a whole series of essential issues from 1956 on. If such hypocritical doubletalk methods can take firm root within our own movement, then whither, Comrades, are we drifting?

In the second place, we refer to the duplicity with which he tried to twist the ideological and political disagreement that obviously exists between the Albanian Workers' Party and the great majority of the Communist and Workers' Parties into a personal attack on Comrade Khrushchev and on the leaders of the Soviet Party and government. This procedure is dishonest, but it is also childish. We would warn our Albanian comrades against such illusions. Insofar as we are concerned, we should like to say to our Albanian comrades that all the Italian Communists, and millions of Italian workers whom our party leads

and influences, not only agree with the positions Comrade Khrushchev has taken during recent years, as well as with those of the leaders of the Soviet Party and government, but feel for Comrade Khrushchev a deep, sincere affection that is anything but formal.

A shock now and then does us good; this is how we feel about the shock that Comrade Khrushchev, as head of the Central Committee of the PCUS, has provided for Communist thinking and activity. We must all strive to grasp the enormous good Comrade Khrushchev has done to the cause of Socialism, and to be grateful to him for it. Italian Communists and workers would consider it a very great misfortune and a serious threat to the unity of the international Communist movement if even a suspicion were to be born that the positions elaborated by the international Communist movement, beginning with the 20th Congress, were in any slightest detail to be called into question by the movement itself.

It should also be obvious that we cannot disguise the ideological and political dissension of which we speak as a dispute involving nothing but relations among certain Socialist countries. We don't want to intervene directly in international relations, but we cannot refrain from pointing out that certain insulting insinuations made by the Albanian delegate in connection with the policies of the Soviet government struck our ear as an insult to the entire assembly. The action of the Albanian delegate appears to us all the more offensive the more it is masked behind only assurances of friendship and fraternity, with epithets and turns of expression that one can conceive of addressing only to a class enemy.

We should also feel that we were scanting our duty, and neglecting our responsibilities to the Italian working class and the entire Western working class, whose international import and weight Comrade Khrushchev so rightly recalled, if we were not to speak out, and firmly, to say that insofar as we are concerned, we are determined to fight to the finish to keep the flag of Marxism-Leninism flying; we shall do so, not with resounding rhetoric, but by defending what we believe to be the sole correct line, the only line that corresponds to the needs of the international workers' movement and the future of the Socialist revolution. We hope, finally, that our disagreement with our Albanian Comrades does not also involve the concept of Socialist legality and democracy, in connection with which we have heard remarks from the Albanian delegate that left us worried indeed.

To go back to our disagreement with our Chinese comrades, we should like to state that it turns on issues that have already been thrashed out at considerable length, whose solutions have been accepted by all the parties, and have provided the inspiration for basic undertakings in the Soviet Union, orienting the activities of the entire workers' and communist movement. Thus the attack and the criticism made by the Chinese comrades on the Central Committee of the PCUS and on Comrade Khrushchev himself undermine the value and the scope of the policy implemented, in recent years, by all the parties; that policy was based on the decisions taken at the 20th and 21st Congresses of the PCUS, and on the documents of the 1957 Moscow Conference.

These decisions must be defended, if we are to protect the results we have already achieved with them, and go on to new ones. The creative spirit of each party must be stimulated, not reined in. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and within the framework of the decisions of the 1957 Moscow Conference, and of those that will be taken at this Conference, every party should, we feel, try to cling ever more closely to the real conditions and potentials in every situation, and to find, in every situation and circumstance, the ways and means and reliable support for furthering the workers' and communist movement.

The facts have shown that peaceful coexistence does not lead to any letup in the fight against imperialism on the national level, nor yet to a slackening in the class struggle within each country. One need only think back over the events of this last year to be convinced of this.

During this last year, the American imperialists have redoubled their provocations, so as to desert their commitments made at Camp David. But despite this, as a consequence of the new international steps taken by the Soviet Union, the ideas of peaceful coexistence and of disarmament have not only not lost ground, but have made new progress in the hearts of the peoples; the imperialists are finding it harder to justify and to carry on their aggressive policies. During this very year, we have seen the strongest kinds of anti-imperialist manifestations among the peoples. In many countries, popular and mass opposition to American meddling and to the servility of their respective governments to the State Department has broken out in vast and violent

was demonstrations that have shaken or even driven out the governments, the men, and the groups most directly responsible for the alienation of their country's sovereignty and for the installation of foreign military bases on its territory. During this very year, dozens of African peoples have shaken off the yoke of colonialism.

We might make the same observations à propos of the effects of the lowered-tension policy on the development of the class struggle, within the individual countries. During the year that has just ended, the Italian Communist Party has completed

major supporting action to the Soviet drive towards an easing of tensions, and has drawn from that drive great assistance in its entire political action. We have, in fact, succeeded in striking a crippling blow at the general acceptance of the usual anti-Communist propaganda, and in bringing about a marked awakening of the united fighting spirit of the masses of the workers and the people.

It is worth noting, in passing, that during this same year the Italian economy reported remarkable growth figures for reduction in certain industrial sectors, and even managed to re-absorb a modest proportion of the vast number of unemployed. The Italian government took this as a pretext for claiming to have performed a sort of economic miracle. As a matter of fact, the Italian economy is still enjoying prosperity, even though the alleged miracle was performed only for the benefit of the big monopolies and of big business, which reaped enormous profits from the poverty of entire regions, from the ruin of the working

masses and the peasants, and from the wretched wages of the Italian laborer, which are the lowest in the entire European Common Market.

And yet, it was in this same year that we in Italy saw a triumphant advance of the entire workers' movement. There was militant struggle all along the line/ major strikes, and all but unanimous ^{worker} participation in the struggles and the street demonstrations against the Tambroni government and the threat of a return to fascism. There was a reflection of this upsurge in the class, labor union, and political struggle in the recent elections, which were particularly favorable to our Party, especially in the industrial towns.

We believe it is a mistake to think that the fighting temper of the masses depends mechanically on the general situation, or on the economic situation in particular. The question is far more complex than that, and, in the last analysis, no matter what the objective conditions may be, the overall action of the Party is the thing that has effect on the fighting temper and the action of the masses. Of course, party action should not consist merely of denunciation and propaganda. It must play upon all the factors involved, establish direct links with all the groups and all the mass sectors engaged, mobilize them, and lead them into action, while actively arousing the broadest possible sympathy and the greatest possible support for them.

This need for mobilization of mass struggle to influence the immediate situation, in order to make it develop in a direction favorable to the needs and aspirations of the masses and to

the advancement of the entire workers' and Communist movement, emerges as a salient point in the issue of peace and war. In this issue we are above all opposed to fatalism and to do-nothingness. The great issue at stake in this Conference is whether, under present conditions, and given the enormous power of destruction, even of extermination, of thermonuclear weapons, war can or cannot be avoided.

The Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the Peace Manifesto both prove, scientifically, on the basis of a Marxist analysis of our time, that war today can be avoided. We say that war can be avoided; we do not say that it is impossible, or that imperialism can do nothing that would cause a war.

On the contrary, we are well aware that the harder things get for the imperialists, the more they see their zone of influence restricted, the more frequent will be the groups of fanatical advocates of war, who will preach the need for trying any experiment, even that of the most deadly kind of war. But these groups will find themselves increasingly isolated, even within the imperialist camp. The new fact, the dominant fact today is this: the imperialist leaders can no longer decide, at their good pleasure, whether it is to be war or peace. They must reckon with the system of Socialist countries, whose power is already greater than that of imperialism. They must reckon with the mobilization and with the active resistance of the people, whose dearest dream is peace.

When we say that war can be avoided, we are not counting on the good intentions of the imperialists, nor on our chances of

converting them with our honeyed discourse. The imperialists will go right on being what they have always been: ready for aggression, for destruction, for plunder. The new element in the situation is this: the imperialists can no longer do what they once could, because there are in the world today people who can bridle them, and who can draw their fangs. Therefore when we say that war can be avoided, we are well aware of the greedy and aggressive nature of imperialism; but we are also confident of the power and of the will for peace of the Socialist countries, and of the power and the will for peace of the people/. In a word, we are confident that the forces of peace will carry the day against those of imperialist war.

But this victory can come about only insofar as the forces of peace remain vigilant, mobilized, ready to stamp out any attempt at imperialist aggression. The Soviet Union and the Socialist countries have shown, and prove every day that they are unsleeping guardians of the peace: that they take the initiative wherever it may ward off the dangers of war; that they are capable of nipping in the bud any provocation, any act that might lead to war. This vigilance, this mobilization of the people, is what the Communist parties everywhere should strive to foster, particularly in those countries still subject to imperialism.

Insofar as we are concerned, we would report that the Soviet Union's policy of peaceful coexistence, and her proposals of disarmament and of a solution via summit conferences of pending international issues, have caused considerable embarrassment to the Italian groups and spokesmen most deeply committed to the cold war,

and have deepened the rifts within the parties closest to the Atlantic policy and to the vendetta policies of Adenauer's Germany.

It is in the mobilization of the people in defense of the peace that the real importance of having a clear-cut stand on the possibility or impossibility of war, under today's conditions, becomes so important. This mobilization will be successful insofar as we reject any notion of inevitability of an imperialist war. Such an idea would quickly dampen any enthusiasm or vigor in mass action. You cannot get the masses to fight for goals that can't be won, particularly if it is you yourself who have said that they can't win.

Keep in mind, furthermore, that without clear and forceful action on our part, in mobilizing the people against imperialist war, we should be leaving the field clear for imperialist propaganda, which, in order to cloak their preparations for war, will try to distract or to lull the vigilance of the masses, and will seek to spread the slander that the Communists are not against war, that the Communists believe that "the worse things are, the better," because they want to use war to achieve Socialism. If we fail to give the lie to such slander by taking a clear-cut stand on the fact that imperialist war is not inevitable, and by keeping up our work of organization and of struggle in defense of the peace, we risk alienating the sympathy of the great masses, that aspire to peace as towards the ultimate good.

Our Chinese Comrades lay down different degrees of inevitability of imperialist war: they believe that a world-wide nuclear conflict is avoidable, but that little local imperialist wars of

aggression will be with us until imperialism is banished from the earth. This differentiation, however, does not stand up. Under present international conditions, every type of imperialist war can be avoided. If it is possible to avoid a world-wide nuclear war, it must be even easier to avoid brush/fire wars, since in both cases the deciding element is the pressure of the people and of all the forces for peace, starting with the power of the Socialist countries.

Furthermore, this is not even an abstract hypothesis any longer, nor does it require further proof. The facts have already proved this possibility. It is a matter of fact that the Soviet

Union's forthright stand forced the imperialist aggressors to stop their aggression against Egypt and Lebanon. I don't think it's necessary, in an assembly of Communists, to point out that, just as we fight against all imperialist aggression, we support every struggle and every war of national liberation. In many countries, we were the ones who mounted and led such wars against the fascist and nazi occupying forces. We shall support any people

who are doing so now, or who may do so in the future.

The relationship between the forces of peace and those of war has changed; but so has the nature of thermonuclear warfare in relation to previous wars. This, if we look at it in yet another way, still further increases our chances of avoiding war. It is known that, in a thermonuclear war, there would be no way to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants. There is practically no limit to the death-dealing power of thermonuclear bombs; they would strike every form of life, animal and vegetable,

peoples, countries, and entire continents, regardless of whether or not they were involved in the war. A thermonuclear war would practically destroy the foundations of modern civilization. This destructive nature of war broadens the possibility of mobilization in defense of the peace, and of attracting strata and groups who are determined not to place the life of their nation in danger, although these same strata and groups, in previous wars, were ready and willing to face up to unspeakable trials and struggles solely in order to maintain their positions as privileged characters and exploiters.

We are not saying that an awareness of the futility and the madness of a thermonuclear war is already a fait accompli, or even that it can be grasped by every order of society. But it is a lesson that has been learnt by many, and one that can be learnt by all the masses of the people, and by the majority of honest and sensible citizens. It is the mobilization of all these forces that can isolate, restrain, and render harmless the leaders and the others who will not face the evidence of the facts. In this way, we can create a situation in which it will be possible to force the capitalist governments to take practical measures to ease tensions and towards disarmament, and to create a situation in which, thanks to the steady strengthening of the Socialist camp, the spread of the national liberation movement, the struggles of the masses of the people, and the action of the other forces interested in peace, war will become impossible in human society, even though Socialism has not yet conquered everywhere.

Our struggle for peace has a deeply human character. We understand the terrible threat that hangs over mankind. We want

to ward off that menace, and to free the peoples from the fear of extermination.

We want to preserve our heritage, material, cultural and human, which is the basis of modern civilization, because we intend to use this heritage for Socialism. Furthermore, the Socialist revolution does not need thermonuclear bombs and ruins and endless battles to pave its way. And no laborer, no worker, would ever agree to pay such a price for Socialism.

What we want is to free mankind from capitalism and from imperialism with the least possible suffering for mankind. Lenin glimpsed this possibility between May and July of 1917; it vanished in the violence and the brutality of the reaction. In the present situation, it becomes real once again in certain countries, thanks to the existence in the world of the Socialist system, to the changed power relationship between capitalism and Socialism, to the power, experience, and potential for action of the workers' and Communist movements in many countries, to the possibility of making alliances for the struggle with new social groups, against the ever more suffocating domination the monopolies hold over the entire political, economic, social and cultural life of the countries of the imperialist camp.

In this connection, it was pointed out by the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and confirmed by the Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers Parties, that it is possible in several countries to achieve a peaceful transition from capitalism to Socialism, on the path of the development of democracy, without any previous

insurrection or civil war, and without going through any new international wars.

Our Chinese Comrades ask us to show them what country is making progress by this means. We answer, with firm confidence, that our own PCI has long acted on this belief, which best fits the Italian situation, and that so far it has succeeded in achieving progress of no dubious value. It was at our last two Congresses, by means of Comrade Togliatti's remarks and the discussion that followed, that we defined exactly what we meant by the democratic way, the Italian way to Socialism. We mean a way of mass democratic struggle, directed at changing the balance of power in Parliament and the political leadership of the country, by changing the real relationship between the political and social forces. Contributing to this change in power relationships we must have, in the first place, militant mobilization of the masses in the factories and in the country, ranged against the bosses and the authorities, in all the local and national popular and democratic institutions. This is the way we must consolidate and broaden our gains in the local, provincial and regional administrations and in Parliament; we must use these democratic institutions as tools for furthering the real power and effective influence of the working masses; we must integrate these institutions with new forms of democracy, including the use of direct democracy. The old and the new democratic institutions must play an increasingly important role in all decisions affecting the economic, productive, welfare, and cultural life of the nation; in this way, we can already impose a de facto limitation,

on the local as well as the national level, on the power of the ruling cliques, just as we can over the power of the bosses in the factories. Within this frame of reference, particular importance is vested, in our party's policies and action, in the struggle for what we call structural reform; this means measures that tend to place effective restrictions on the power of the great monopolies over the nation's entire life, to nationalise certain industries, to establish forms of democratic control over certain sectors of the national economy, and, first and foremost, over the public sectors of the economy, to bring about far-reaching agrarian reform, and so on. These aims, which go beyond the immediate defense and the more elementary demands of the workers, were once generally defined in the Communist movement as aims of a transitional character. Lenin considered it allowable and necessary for the Communist Party, under certain circumstances, and particularly in periods of revolutionary crisis, to adopt such aims as these. The history of the Bolshevik Party and of the Russian revolutions affords some classic examples of this principle. We believe that in the present phase of history, and particularly in certain countries, such as Italy, the planning of the struggle for such goals as these is an important and permanent task of a Communist party unwilling to limit itself to general propaganda of Socialist ideas, to the defense of the immediate interests and elementary ^{democratic} demands of the workers' organizations, but which intends to play a major rôle in real social and political progress towards socialism throughout society. For 13 years, now, a bitter struggle has been waged against the

workers' movement in general and the Communist Party in particular in Italy, with very evident discrimination in politics and in the unions. They have tried to violate the freedoms of the workers and of the people, to ignore and trample upon the republican Constitution. This was the fruit of the Italian people's armed resistance to fascism and to the Nazi occupation; it contains within itself the essential elements for building a new society and a new State, in which the roots of fascism will be forever confined, and in which an effective and radical solution to the nation's basic problems can be started, building a new power whose roots will be in the working classes, in the peasants, and in the working middle class.

Therefore we have based our entire political action on the popular mass struggle to win respect for and implementation of all the political, economic and social reforms called for in the Constitution of the Republic. On this ground, we have scored successes in the past, and we manage to mobilize large masses of the people and to contract broad alliances on many issues; often these reach deep into the ranks of the Republicans, the Social Democrats, and even the Catholics and Christian Democrats. On the basis of mobilization and of popular struggles like these, we have often succeeded in forcing practical measures in land reform, in industrial development, in employment, in welfare assistance to the various categories of labor, including pensions for peasants, artisans, and housewives. On the political level, we have succeeded, and are still successful, despite the resistance of the conservatives, in defending the freedoms won with the victory over fascism,

in defending local and regional autonomy, in bringing the peripheral democratic institutions into participation in the decisions affecting local economic and social life. We have succeeded in achieving remarkable results in every field of our activity because, despite the bitter war waged against us by the forces of the bosses, of the government, and of the police, we do our best to do just a little more than denunciation and propaganda on every issue. Our Party tries to present itself consistently to the public as a positive political force, one that can find a fair and feasible solution to every problem that arises, and one that is willing to do battle for that solution once it is found. This is how we have managed, during all these years of anti-communist discrimination and of clerical domination, to chalk up such remarkable economic and social victories, to protect democratic freedoms when they were beset by clerico-fascism, to thwart all attempts at authoritarian reaction in the republican régime, and to advance the cause of the workers' and peoples's movement, and hence of democracy in Italy.

An initial attempt by the reactionaries to change parliamentary representation by means of a rascally electoral law, and thus to reduce Parliament to a mere façade, was beaten seven years ago in a great battle in Parliament and by a fighting mobilization of the people. Recently, the DC and the reactionaries, with the Rumbroni government, first transformed the ragged remnants of the Italian fascist movement into allies of the government, and then made a serious attempt at a coup d'état for the establishment of an authoritarian régime. Profound popular indignation, mass strikes and demonstrations, bitter clashes with the police and the authorities, with more than ten dead and hundreds wounded, forced the

Christian Democrats to back down.

The recent local elections indicated a further shift to the left in the Italian political alignment, in which our Party acquired additional strength despite anti-Communist discrimination. As a matter of fact, out of every four voters in Italy, one votes Communist; out of every five, two vote either Communist or Socialist.

Communists and Socialists, often in alliance with other left-wing parties, head the administration of many large cities and many provinces. One of the autonomous regions, the Aosta Valley, on the French border, is governed by the Communists and their allies. If all the Italian regions had their own governments, as they should have, under the Constitution, three more of the most vital regions in our country would be governed by leftist parties, with the Communist Party at their head. In the workers' struggle, in the fight against fascism, in the battle to get regional self-government and implementation of other measures called for by the Constitution, increasingly broad alliances are emerging with members and spokesmen of parties whose leaders preach anti-communism and discrimination against us. In the battle against the recent attempted authoritarian coup d'état, even some of these national leaders, in order to avoid total isolation, were forced to join with the aroused people, and thus, willy-nilly, to contribute to the scope and the success of the anti-fascist movement. After the struggle that overthrew the clerico-fascist government, this gentry went back to anti-communism; but it finds its positions there increasingly

lonely, since the united anti-fascist movement of the people has made new strides forward, with important posts occupied by the intellectuals and the young workers and students. This is the way young Italians give the lie to the slanders of the clerical and bourgeois ruling class, with their allegations about "flaming youth," and prove with deeds that they are a great revolutionary force.

It seems to us that this experience of ours is the best possible proof of the soundness of the line we have followed to limit the powers of the monopolies, to thwart any attempt at authoritarian transformation of the democratic State, and to achieve the program of radical democratic reform that was adopted in the decisions of the Rome Conference of the 17 Parties. With these struggles we have checkmated the reactionaries and pushed the democratic workers' and people's movement forward into new positions that will shorten its march to Socialism. This is the way the PCI sees and lives its struggle for the Italian path to Socialism, which is, we repeat, a path of democratic struggle, of Parliamentary struggle, of mass pressure and of clashes, even violent ones, to shatter the resistance of the conservative and reactionary forces and any attack on the rights and the will of the people, to extend and consolidate the alliance of the working class with the peasants and with other levels of the working middle class, and, within this alliance, to affirm the leadership function of the working class. This is the way we believe we can rally the majority of the people to our Socialist program, thus creating the conditions for the working class and its allies

to achieve political power; and that achievement is still the *sine qua non* for the Socialist transformation of society.

Whether we keep our struggle on this peaceful and democratic plane does not depend upon ourselves alone. It depends on the attitude of the conservatives and the reactionaries towards the advance of the workers and the people. We agree that we should always be mindful of the fact that the reactionaries, failing to stem the popular tide on the democratic level, may resort to open violence to stop it. But in our opinion this need for alertness need not lead us into a double outlook, or a double set of practical preparations. Our Chinese Comrades ask us: how then do you go about building up the revolutionary forces needed to achieve the Socialist revolution, and to defeat any recourse to violence on the part of the reactionaries? And we answer: we cling a little more tightly to the cause of the defense and development of all the democratic freedoms; we go all-out in organizing, mobilizing, and fostering the fighting temper of the people; every day, we add a little more strength, a little more breadth, to the fighting alliances between the working class and the great masses of the people, thus achieving, in the struggle, the working-class' proper function of leadership. The tenor of this mobilization and of this fighting temper is the most effective of all means for discouraging the reactionaries from recourse to open violence, or, in case they should resort to it at any cost, it is the best way to ready ourselves to beat them on their own ground.

In conclusion, we are firm that our experience in democratic mass struggle and in resistance to authoritarian and police efforts

to bar the road to the advance of the democratic and proletarian forces, completely bears out, in our opinion, the correctness and the timeliness of the political approach of the PCI and of the principle affirmed by the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the Moscow Declaration, as to the possibility of a peaceful and democratic transition to Socialism in a number of capitalist countries.

Our Chinese Comrades urge us not to forget the differences between Communists and Socialists, and not to generalize on the positions of specific left wings of the individual leftist parties/. We in Italy have a peculiar situation in this connection: there is a Social Democrat party, without much influence, based on the people, the petite bourgeoisie, and the workers; and there is a Socialist Party which, as all the Comrades know, despite its recent uncertainty and vacillation, is still quite distinct and separate from all the Social Democrat Parties. Until only yesterday, the Italian Socialist Party was linked with us by a unity of action agreement; with us it leads the class labor unions, and with us it governs cities and provinces. However, in this area, it has evidenced uncertainty and hesitation that cost it a significant loss of votes in the recent elections.

We are not forgetting the differences between ourselves and the Social Democrats, between ourselves and the left-wing groups, like the Republicans and the Radicals, between ourselves and our comrades in the Socialist Party. But neither do we forget the de facto agreements, the real convergences, the identity of demands that exist between our own social and political action and real interests and aspirations of the major and most advanced share

of the members of these parties, and even of some of their leaders. To note and to point out the differences that exist between the Communist Party and other parties on the left should not lead us to overlook the possibility of influencing and of winning over to united and democratic action the rank and file power of these parties, and, in certain cases, the parties as a whole.

We should point out and criticize the shortcomings, the mistakes, and even the betrayals of the leaders of these parties, whenever the circumstances require it; but we must do so bearing constantly in mind the agreement and the goals we share with the better part of the rank and file of these parties, so as to influence and win over this rank and file to united action, encouraging it, if we can, to fight within its own organization against this attitude and this orientation.

This is the policy we have held, and which we still maintain towards the other left-wing parties, and towards the Socialist Party itself. The Social Democrats and the Republicans, who have always been openly anti-communists, have watched their ranks dwindle away. The Socialist Party, despite the unremitting pressure to which it has been subjected by its own right-wing leaders, and by anti-communist forces from outside, turned down an appeal to forswear class unity in the labor unions and in other mass organizations, and collaboration with us in local government. On many political issues the PSI's views do not differ substantially from our own. This is to be ascribed to our unity policy as it has consistently been applied to the PSI.

Of course, we make no claim to hold up our own experience

as a model for all to follow. The situation differs from country to country, and so does the nature and makeup of the various Socialist and Social Democrat Parties. We made bold to recount our experience simply in order to show our brother parties how the PCI, within the given Italian situation, went about furthering its policy of broad alliances, denouncing and criticizing the leaders and the parties that oppose united popular action, but trying, at the same time, to establish contact and collaboration with the members and leaders of every party, including even the Catholic organizations and the Christian Democrats, who are ready to work with us, albeit on limited grounds and for specific objectives.

We know that in this way we have succeeded in consolidating and broadening the leadership function of the working class and of the Communist Party during the struggle; we know that we have spread through increasingly broad strata of workers and democrats the awareness of the need for struggle, and the urgency of radical political and social change in the direction of Socialism. This is how we have succeeded in weakening the political monopoly of the Christian Democrats, in plunging their network of alliances into crisis, and in winning, despite all obstacles, more advanced positions from which the democratic workers' movement can go on along the path to Socialism.

Thanks to this policy, which we believe to be quite free of any dogmatism and any sectarianism, we have managed without too much difficulty to combat revisionism within our own ranks, to discredit it, isolate it among the ranks of the democratic workers' movement. Our experience proves to us that you cannot fight revisionism except on the basis of a sound political line, built on

the solid foundations of Marxism-Leninism, and inspired by the principles formulated in the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties in 1957.

This Conference of ours was called to allow of fraternal debate on the problems that have arisen since the 1957 Moscow Conference, and to clarify certain points in the documents that were approved at that time, but on which differences have since emerged. The purpose of our debate, therefore, is to single out, together, the aspects and the scope of the new elements in the situation, in order to get over any differences in interpretation, and to work out common stands which will serve as guides to the orientation and action of our parties. In this connection, we hereby state our complete agreement with the text of the new Declaration, where it reminds us that the interests of the Communist movement require the constant and united application, by all Communist Parties, of the decisions taken collectively by the brother parties in their conferences. Furthermore, for the maintenance of good relations among Communist parties, and in order that the authority and autonomy of each of them be respected, every party must refrain, and order its members to refrain from all factional activity among the rank and file and within the bodies of the other parties. All exchange of information and all critical observations between party and party must be channelled through the responsible bodies in each of them.

All the Communist Parties are independent, with equal rights, and are responsible for working out their own policies in relation to actual conditions in their respective countries. We

recognize the gigantic merit of the CPSU, the great value of its decisions in the orientation of the Communist movement throughout the world. But we agree with Comrade Khrushchev, when he asked us, in the name of the CPSU, to turn down any expression that might lead to the notion of leading parties and led parties.

It was recognized, at the 21st CPSU Congress, that the situations in individual countries are now so varied, and that the tasks required differ so widely from case to case, that there can be no single world directorate of the whole Communist movement. Furthermore, the Communist Parties are full-grown now, and quite capable of handling their own affairs. Hence any formulation that might imply subordination of some Communist Parties to another is incorrect, and therefore useless, as Comrade Khrushchev observed. It would simply make trouble for the Communist Parties, and make the CPSU responsible for the political line of each individual party, whereas the only people who can properly take the responsibility are the party's own leadership.

For the same reason, the Italian delegation feels that it would be unwise to adopt the suggestion made by several delegations and establish, at the conclusion of our Conference, a secretariat, or any other permanent body of the kind. In our opinion, such a body could render no practical service to the Communist Parties. We feel that, for the exchange of experience and for co-ordination of Communist Party activities, all that is needed is an occasional exchange of information and of delegations, the convocation of special conferences of several or all

the parties, to work out special issues of political orientation, such as was done with the Moscow Conference of 1957, the Rome Conference of the 17 parties, the Bucharest Conference, and the Conference at which we are present now.

The Chinese Comrades, and Comrade Teng Siao Ping in his remarks, in connection with the points of divergence, raised the point that history will tell which was right. I trust that our Chinese Comrades will allow me to differ. Communist parties do not exist to record the verdicts of history, but to make history. And they want to make history on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, mutually assisting one another, and moving together, under the conditions peculiar to each country, towards our common goal, which is Communism. This Conference was summoned in order to arrive, through fraternal discussion, at a joint elaboration of the basic concepts that should provide the practical inspiration for the action of each party, and not to wait for history to judge as to which party is right and which is wrong. This is a luxury we cannot afford, because, among other reasons, History will not wait while we make up our minds. History moves continuously ahead, always raising new problems to solve, new goals to be reached. In order to intervene effectively, in order to influence and determine the course of History, the Communist movement must be united. Out of this Conference must emerge unity of our ranks and unity of action. There should be no question of a formal unity, but rather of effective and substantial unity.

Our Chinese Comrades will allow me to say to them that I failed to note, in their remarks or in their proposals, any real desire to arrive at such unity. You do not work for unity when you lodge against the PCUS, its leaders, and Comrade Khrushchev, who shoulder such a heavy weight of responsibility in the international workers' movement and in the leadership of the socialist camp, such serious accusations, as did the Chinese delegation, or couched in such a form. You are not working for unity when you claim the right to maintain and propagate, even after the Conference, all your own views, which will not be embodied in the closing Declaration, and call upon History for the final judgement. None of us has any right to consider himself the sole repository, by his own decision, of Marxist-Leninist truth. The creative nature of Marxism-Leninism demands a continuous elaboration of all experience of the workers' and Communist movement, and the active participation of all parties in that elaboration. It is conferences like this, it is the decisions we shall reach at the conclusion of our work here, that should represent, for all of us, the Marxist-Leninist basis for our own orientation, the unfailing guide for our own actions.

The PCI has the greatest esteem and admiration for the Chinese people, for the Chinese Communist Party, its leadership, and the great achievements it has made. It is therefore in the most fraternal spirit that, in the name of the Italian Communists, I make bold to conclude my remarks with an appeal to our Chinese comrades to stop and think, to consider all the consequences their attitude may have on the international workers' and Communist movement. Theirs is the responsibility for the fact that here in this

assembly, their own portentous words were followed by others like those of the Albanian delegate, singled out, and not by mere chance, ^{by} one of the most prestigious leaders of the revolutionary mass struggle, Comrade Passionaria, as provocative and unfit to be uttered by a militant proletarian. I hope that our Chinese comrades will give careful thought to what has been said here by almost all the Communist and workers' parties, and will sincerely accept and apply the conclusions at which we arrive at the end of this Conference. Those conclusions will be the guide and the axis for the immediate future for the world-wide Communist movement.

PART III

SECOND SPEECH OF COMRADE LUIGI LONGO FOR THE
DELEGATION OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (PCI)

My dear comrades,

We asked for the floor merely to make a few remarks on the second speech of Comrade Teng Siao Ping.

We wish first of all to state that we absolutely cannot agree with the interpretation the Chinese comrades would put upon the discussion that has engaged the international Communist movement of recent months.

According to our Chinese comrades, almost all the Communist parties, under the influence of the PCUS, have strayed from the spirit and the substance of the 1957 Moscow Declaration, and have

surrendered, on a whole series of major issues, to revisionist and opportunist views. According to them, it is only the Chinese Communist Party that could have corrected this trend, and therefore its action here is useful and necessary. We flatly reject this statement as contrary to fact. The real state of affairs is altogether different. It was the Chinese comrades, with their articles and their positions, which they have developed within international circles, who brought the Moscow Declaration, the great ideological and political victories that have been achieved on that basis, by the individual parties and by the international communist movement as a whole, under discussion again. The Chinese comrades, by their actions, sown the seeds of doubt, uncertainty, and confusion within the international communist and workers' movement, and have made the tasks of many parties far more difficult

by creating the impression that the Communist movement wanted to turn back towards old and outworn dogmatic and sectarian positions.

We therefore reject the interpretation the Chinese comrades suggest of the positions taken at this Conference by almost all of the Communist and workers' parties, and reflected in the draft Declaration.

We regret that the Chinese comrades, in their second intervention, showed no signs of wishing to take account of the arguments and the exigencies set forth by the spokesmen for their brother parties. This is the attitude that gives us the most concern for the political unity and the unity of action of the Communist movement.

We believe that insofar as the stipulation of the forms in which unity within the movement and respect for decisions taken in common are concerned, discussions are legitimate. But precisely as a consequence of the attitude taken by our Chinese comrades, we feel it more than ever necessary that our Conference confirm, and forcefully, in its concluding resolutions, the inadmissibility of any party's opposing the general line agreed upon in this Conference, or in any other international Conference.

In conclusion, we maintain that it is still necessary to extend once again a hopeful appeal to our Chinese Comrades, that their delegation and the Central Committee of their Party reflect on the consequences that their stand may have for the international Communist movement, and take due account of the arguments, the positions, and the needs of all their brother Communist and workers' parties.

*PART IV - LETTER FROM THE PCI DELEGATION TO COMRADE N.S. KHRUSHCHEV
AND TO THE PCUS DELEGATION TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE 18
COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES*

Dear Comrades,

We should have liked to tell you again in person about some of our concerns over certain problems discussed at the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties. In view of the need for informing you of our concern before the end of the work of the drafting Committee, and in view of the difficulty, because of your other engagements, of obtaining an interview with you immediately, we take this opportunity of expressing our views to you in writing, directly, and in confidence.

We would like first of all to tell you once again, as we said when we took the floor at the Conference, that we are in complete agreement with your party in defense of the correct positions on principle and policies which were accepted by some parties and, unfortunately, rejected by others in completely unjustifiable tones. We feel that the draft declaration submitted to the Conference, although a bit too prolix, substantially reflects these correct positions. However, in our opinion, it is a step backward on certain issues by comparison with the precision and the clarity of the 1957 Moscow Declaration, and with the draft you presented at the September meeting. Beyond any doubt, this is a result of the need for finding formulations acceptable to all. We understand that it is was perhaps inevitable, in view of the situation that has arisen; and yet we cannot conceal from you the fact that our Party in particular would find itself in serious

trouble in carrying out its overall action if a proper solution were not provided for at least some of the problems covered in the Declaration.

The first of these, and the most important for us, is the problem of the 20th Congress. We feel that it would do serious harm to the entire Communist movement, and would constitute a deadly blow to our Party if there should be no explicit statement in the Declaration in favor of the meaning and the permanent validity of its decisions. Therefore we believe that the Communist and Workers' Parties cannot be allowed to be the object of any compromise or any retreat on this point.

Further, we lay particular importance on the passage in the Declaration dealing with Yugoslav revisionism. On this point we have prepared an amendment, which we attach. In it you will find, as is only correct, a harsh condemnation of the ideological and political positions and of the practical activities of the Yugoslav leaders. In this, our amendment does not stray from the substance of the concepts expressed in the draft Declaration. However, it is couched in less bitter and offensive terms, such as not to arouse any irremediable break with Yugoslav public opinion, which we know by experience is very sensitive to anything that can be used by the Yugoslav leaders to twist and distort criticism of themselves into an insult to the national feelings of the people. Our amendment also tries to reduce to more accurate proportions the influence of Yugoslav revisionism today within the international Communist movement. Lastly, our amendment completely eliminates the view, which we feel altogether erroneous, that

one of the basic tasks of the Communist and workers' parties is to "isolate Yugoslavia from the workers' movement." This, in our view, is a mistake, first of all because it contains an implicit condemnation of the action taken in 1955 by the CPSU in agreement with all the Communist Parties, in connection with the Yugoslav Communist League. In the second place, it is a mistake because practically it could tend to hamper present contacts, which often prove fruitful, between the Yugoslav unions, organizations for peace, etc., and those in many Socialist and non-Socialist countries. We cannot take a position towards the Yugoslav Communist League that conflicts so radically with our attitude towards the Social Democrats in general, the left-wing Socialist parties, the labor and working-class organizations of many countries, and even many of their leaders.

We should like here to point out a fact that often escapes some comrades who do not work in capitalist countries. The tone in which we speak of our quarrel with the Yugoslav Communist League is one of the units of measurement by which the Social Democrat parties and unions, and public opinion in general, evaluate the sincerity of our unity policies, and our capacity for collaboration with groups ideologically and politically foreign to us.

Lastly, we should like to express our approval of your happy solution, acceptable to all, of the question of the unity of the international workers' and Communist movement. We agree whole-heartedly that the Declaration should exclude any possibility of factional subversion by one party towards its brother parties, or within the international organizations. But we feel

that it would be more helpful, at the point to which the discussion has carried us, to express this need in positive terms, stating that the essential criteria to which the Communist and workers' parties must refer should be reflected in their mutual relations. This is what we attempted to do in the first part of our amendment, which we have not yet submitted, and whose text we attach herewith for your opinion. The standards set forth in it exclude, expressly and de facto, any possibility of factional subversion between parties. Should this part of our amendment be adopted, it would be superfluous to retain the reference to the "inadmissibility of factionalism" in the draft declaration.

We are certain that you will understand the motives and the spirit that inspired this letter.

Fraternal greetings,

Luigi Longo

(For the Italian Communist Party
Delegation.)

6182

- END -